

User Workshop on Utilization Management Concept Development for the International Space Station

11 July, 2002

Doubletree Hotel, Challenger Ballroom
Cocoa Beach, Florida

Green Group Findings

These findings are a synopsis of the notes provided by the working group to the NASA Utilization Management Concept Development Team. Its content has been taken from notes provided by the working group and from notes taken during their User Workshop out-briefing.

What's Working

- All of the functions were either broken or needed some improvement.
- There is a process that is changing things, but there are still things that are broken.

What's “Broke”

- Funding levels granted by HQ are subject to cuts by the centers.
- The peer review process tends to think of the ISS as the only platform.
- No user advocate for de-manifest decisions.
- No Preplanned Product Improvement focused on research.
- No ability for the NGO to advocate for money.

“Broken” functions

- Function 1
 - ✓ Need to know who is in charge (have one focal point).
 - ✓ Need to shorten cycle times.
 - ✓ Need to eliminate layers.
 - ✓ Need for the NGO to be an advocate for the users.
 - ✓ Someone needs to be “in charge” of all research - science, technology and commercial.

- Function 2
 - ✓ Too much duplication.
 - ✓ Noted that science needs to influence the process.
 - ✓ Decided that NGO must prepare the budget request.

“Broken” functions, continued

- Function 3 (this one was not broken)
 - ✓ User establishes requirements; NGO manages the research requirements.
- Function 4
 - ✓ Needs a common set of standards; the way of operating is different at each center (ie: some centers build payloads in house while others contract out).
 - ✓ Needs a single point of entrance for users.
 - ✓ NGO should apprise users of the availability of equipment and have a catalog of all available hardware.
 - ✓ Needs to encompass all types of research: science, technology and commercial.

“Broken” functions, continued

- Function 5
 - ✓ Need to standardize equipment.
 - ✓ Need to recognize that there is more than one type of risk.
The green group identified three such risks: *
 - Safety risk to vehicle and crew
 - Business risk
 - Risk to research
 - ✓ PI’s should decide whether they want to MILSPEC equipment.

* *The green group concluded that PI’s should take ownership of the second two risks.*

“Broken” functions, continued

- Function 10
 - ✓ Green group concluded that this was not an NGO function.
Rather, the NGO should decide when and whether facilities should be built.
 - ✓ NGO should determine requirements.
 - ✓ NGO could help to defuse some of the political pressures associated with construction decisions.

“Broken” functions, continued

- Function 13
 - ✓ One organization must have the big picture in order to optimize *all* research on ISS.
 - ✓ Hubble has researchers working with vehicle and they (the users) made the vehicle more efficient. Should attempt if something like this can be done with ISS – a platform catering to multiple disciplines.
 - ✓ User concerns must be considered, not just vehicle concerns.
 - ✓ Need an NGO which understands user concerns and is accountable to the user community to interface with the vehicle.

“Broken” functions, continued

- Function 14
 - ✓ Too many people in the process; need to reduce personnel to essential functions only.
 - ✓ The Payload data library (PDL) is currently not utilized, though there are a lot of requests for the same data; there should be single points of entry for data submission and retrieval of information to the PDL.

“Broken” functions, continued

- Function 18
 - ✓ PI’s are in the best position for outreach and should spend more time and money on this (possibly by hiring a firm to publicize the results of their research).
 - ✓ Need to make archives more available, recognizing the intellectual property interests that commercial payloads may have. The archives should be web based and their results well cataloged on the web site.
 - ✓ Need to get positive things out of the ISS immediately. There is a public relationship aspect to ISS. Hubble has weekly press releases with pictures. Can an NGO managing ISS do the same?
 - ✓ The NGO needs to lobby; NFS doubled its budget through the lobbying done on its behalf.

Other Thoughts, Considerations

- 1) The Role of NASA Headquarters
 - Center negotiations should be eliminated.
 - Research selections should made by HQ and with the NGO supporting. Then the budget should be transferred to the NGO. Reasons for selection by HQ include:
 - It is an inherently governmental function
 - The current system has integrity
 - Fear of the unknown
- 2) Hardware
 - NGO needs to attempt to offset the desire of PI's to have new hardware built for their research. The NGO should consider modifying existing hardware to meet the researcher's needs or otherwise getting less research.
- 3) Commercial Barters
 - NGO should help facilitate commercial barters (ie: donation of hardware or facilities for an offset).

Green Group Members

1. Don Avery, NASA - LARC
2. Ted Bateman, Bioserv Space Technologies
3. Rich Beatty, NASA - JPL
4. Don Blick, Raytheon
5. Marvin Bumgardner, Institute for Software Research
6. Jeff Cirdeanas, USRA
7. John Conway, Conway Material Services Inc.
8. Stephanie Countryman, Bioserv Space Technologies
9. John Cox, Computer Sciences Corp.
10. Ron Davidson, Guigne
11. Larry DeLucas, University of Alabama, Birmingham
12. Fletcher Kurtz, Computer Sciences Corp.
13. Cory Logan, United Space Alliance
14. Vedha Nayagam, Case Western Reserve University
15. G. Paul Neitzel, George Tech
16. James Preston, Computer Sciences Corp.
17. Keith Robinson, NASA - MSFC
18. Bill Taylor, Raytheon
19. Marc Timm, Spacejazz
20. Andrew Tygelski, NASA - MSFC
21. Willie Williams, NASA - JSC
22. Weijia Zhou, University of Wisconsin

NASA ISS Utilization Team participants:

- Eve Lyon, NASA - HQ
- Jim Scheib, NASA - JSC

Facilitator: Bill Taylor

Recorder: Rich Beatty

Presenter: Ron Davidson